

REMARKS**Claim Objections**

The Examiner has objected to claims 12 and 15 because of informalities. Applicant has amended claims 12 and 15 to correct the informalities. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to remove the objection to claims 12 and 15.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being unpatentable over Chiu et al. (US Publication 2003-0088633) (“Chiu”) and further in view of Kister et al. (US Patent 7,162,513) (“Kister”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant’s invention as claimed in claims 1, 2, 7, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 22-24.

Chiu teaches a system for remotely controlling mobile communication devices including a redirection system, a remote control system and a mobile data communication device. (Chiu abstract) Chiu specifically discloses in Figure 1 of Chiu that redirection software (12A) located within a desktop computer (10A) interfaces with the Internet network (18) and more specifically with a single mobile device (24). There is a single wireless/mobile device described in Chiu.

Kister teaches a system for distributing electronic messages to a wireless data processing device. (Kister abstract) More specifically, Kister discloses in Figure 1 of Kister that a client desktop (110) interfaces with a service (100), which in turn interfaces

with a wireless device (101) over a wireless network (120). There is a single wireless/mobile device disclosed in Kister.

With respect to independent claim 1 in the presently claimed invention, Applicant teaches and claims:

“A method, comprising sending a message on a wireless network from a wireless device to a mobile computer, if the mobile computer receives the message, sending a confirmation that the message was received to the wireless device, and disabling the mobile computer, and if the wireless device does not receive the acknowledgement, queuing the message, checking the wireless network for the reconnectivity of the mobile computer to the network, and sending the queued message to the mobile computer upon the mobile computer reconnecting to the network.” (Claim 1) (Emphasis added)

Applicant submits that Chiu and Kister, each taken alone or in combination, do not render newly amended independent claim 1 obvious at least because neither teach sending a message on a wireless network from a wireless device to a mobile computer or teach if the mobile computer receives the message, sending a confirmation that the message was received to the wireless device. As stated above, Chiu is limited to a redirection system on a desktop computer that interfaces with the mobile device. This is entirely different than a wireless device sending a message to a mobile computer as well as the subsequent confirmation being returned to the wireless device. Kister has a similar limitation to Chiu, as also stated above.

Independent claims 17 and 23 include similar limitations as independent claim 1, thus for at least the same reasons discussed above in reference to independent claim 1, Applicant asserts that Chiu and Kister, each taken alone or in combination, do not render independent claims 17 and 23 obvious.

Claims 2, 7, 10-12, 14, 15, 18, 22, and 24 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 17, and 23 respectively. Thus for at least the same reasons discussed above in reference to independent claims 1, 17, and 23, Applicant asserts that Chiu and Kister, each taken alone or in combination, do not render claims 2, 7, 10-12, 14, 15, 18, 22, and 24 as obvious.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of pending claims 1, 2, 7, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 22-24.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 16, 19, and 25 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being unpatentable over Chiu and Kister as applied to claims 1, 17, and 23 above, and further in view of Iwasa et al. (US Publication 2003-0199267) (“Iwasa”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant’s invention as claimed in claims 3, 16, 19, and 25.

Claims 3, 16, 19, and 25 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 17, and 23 respectively. Thus for at least the same reasons discussed above in reference to independent claims 1, 17, and 23, Applicant asserts that Chiu, Kister, and Iwasa, each taken alone or in combination, do not render claims 3, 16, 19, and 25 as obvious. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of pending claims 3, 16, 19, and 25.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being unpatentable over Chiu and Kister as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Freathy et al. (US Patent 6,774,797) (“Freathy”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant’s invention as claimed in claims 5 and 6.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from and further limit independent claim 1. Thus for at least the same reasons discussed above in reference to independent claim 1, Applicant asserts that Chiu, Kister, and Freathy, each taken alone or in combination, do not render claims 5 and 6 as obvious. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of pending claims 5 and 6.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 9, 21, and 27 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being unpatentable over Chiu, Kister, and Iwasa as applied to claims 3, 19, and 25, and further in view of Freathy. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant’s invention as claimed in claims 8, 9, 21, and 27.

Claims 8, 9, 21, and 27 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 17, and 23, respectively. Thus for at least the same reasons discussed above in reference to independent claims 1, 17, and 23, Applicant asserts that Chiu, Kister, Iwasa, and Freathy, each taken alone or in combination, do not render claims 8, 9, 21, and 27 as obvious. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of pending claims 8, 9, 21, and 27.

The Examiner has rejected claims 13 and 28 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being unpatentable over Chiu and Kister as applied to claims 2 and 23, and further in view of

Lee et al. (US Patent 6,741,851) (“Lee”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant’s invention as claimed in claims 13 and 28.

Claims 13 and 28 depend from and further limit independent claims 1 and 23, respectively. Thus for at least the same reasons discussed above in reference to independent claims 1 and 23, Applicant asserts that Chiu, Kister, and Lee, each taken alone or in combination, do not render claims 13 and 28 as obvious. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of pending claims 13 and 28.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 50-4238. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Derek J. Reynolds at (916) 356-5374.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: February 15, 2008 /Derek J. Reynolds/
Derek J. Reynolds
Reg. No.: 60,104

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(916)356-5358